

# PATENT COOPERATION EATY PCT

### INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference RCA 88250		of Transmittal of International Search Report 220) as well as, where applicable, item 5 below.
International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	(Earliest) Priority Date (day/month/year)
PCT/US 97/22845	15/12/1997	18/12/1996
Applicant THOMSON CONSUMER ELECTRON	ICS, INC. et al.	·
according to Article 18. A copy is being tra  This International Search Report consists		
Certain claims were found uns     Unity of invention is lacking(s		
international search was carried filed furn	ntains disclosure of a <b>nucleotide and/or amin</b> out on the basis of the sequence listing with the international application.  ished by the applicant separately from the international but not accompanied by a statement to the matter going beyond the disclosure in the ascribed by this Authority	ernational application, he effect that it did not include
X the	text is approved as submitted by the applicant text has been established by this Authority to FOR RECOMPRESSION OF INTERL	read as follows:
the s	text is approved as submitted by the applicant text has been established, according to Rule 3 III. The applicant may, within one month from rch Report, submit comments to this Authority	38.2(b), by this Authority as it appears in other date of mailing of this International
beca	shed with the abstract is: uggested by the applicant. ause the applicant failed to suggest a figure. ause this figure better characterizes the invent	None of the figures.

### INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No PCT/US 97/22845

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER IPC 6 H04N7/50

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

#### **B. FIELDS SEARCHED**

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

IPC 6 HO4N

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

Category °	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	EP 0 687 111 A (SICAN GMBH) 13 December 1995 see abstract see page 4, line 13 - page 5, line 2 see page 6, line 49 - page 7, line 23 see figure 5	1-16
<b>Y</b>	EP 0 688 135 A (DAE WOO ELECTRONICS CO LTD) 20 December 1995 see abstract see column 2, line 44 - column 3, line 22 see column 4, line 7 - column 5, line 44 see figure 1	1-5,8-15

X Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.	χ Patent family members are listed in annex.
<ul> <li>Special categories of cited documents:</li> <li>"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance</li> <li>"E" earlier document but published on or after the international filing date</li> <li>"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)</li> <li>"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means</li> <li>"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed</li> </ul>	"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention  "X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone  "Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.  "8" document member of the same patent family
Date of the actual completion of theinternational search  16 April 1998	Date of mailing of the international search report 23/04/1998
Name and mailing address of the ISA  European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk  Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,  Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016	Authorized officer  Hampson, F

2



International Application No PCT/US 97/22845

	ation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
ategory °	Citation of document, with indication,where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Re	levant to claim No.
P,Y	US 5 675 424 A (PARK JONG SEOK) 7 October 1997 see abstract see column 5, line 12 - column 5, line 24 see figures 5,6 & KR 9 509 680 (25 August 1995)		1,4,6,7, 14-16
A	YASHIMA Y; SHIMIZU A; KOTERA H: "AN HDTV PARALLEL CODING METHOD BASED ON IMAGE DIVISION" PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON SIGNAL PROCESSING OF HDTV, VI, 26 - 28 October 1994, TURIN, ITALY, pages 489-501, XP002059592 see page 489, paragraph 2 - page 489, paragraph 3		1,10,14
A	EP 0 687 112 A (MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC IND COLTD) 13 December 1995 see abstract see column 11, line 30 - column 13, line 19 see figure 2		1,10,14

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT Information on patent family members

International Application No PCT/US 97/22845

Patent document cited in search report	Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
EP 0687111 /	13-12-95	DE 4419678 A DE 4436956 A CA 2151023 A	07-12-95 18-04-96 07-12-95
EP 0688135 /	A 20-12-95	CN 1126408 A JP 8009389 A US 5646690 A	10-07-96 12-01-96 08-07-97
US 5675424 /	A 07–10–97	KR 9509680 B	25-08-95
EP 0687112 /	A 13-12-95	JP 7336681 A JP 8084339 A	22-12-95 26-03-96

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

### From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU **PCT United States Patent and Trademark NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION** (Box PCT) (PCT Rule 61.2) Crystal Plaza 2 Washington, DC 20231 **ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE** Date of mailing (day/month/year) in its capacity as elected Office 14 July 1998 (14.07.98) Applicant's or agent's file reference International application No. **RCA 88250** PCT/US97/22845 Priority date (day/month/year) International filing date (day/month/year) 18 December 1996 (18.12.96) 15 December 1997 (15.12.97) **Applicant** KRANAWETTER, Greg, Alan et al 1. The designated Office is hereby notified of its election made: X in the demand filed with the International Preliminary Examining Authority on: 24 June 1998 (24.06.98) in a notice effecting later election filed with the International Bureau on: 2.

		•
	•	
e election	X was	
	was not	
ade before	ne expiration of 19 months from the priority date or, where Rule 32 applies,	within the time limit under
ile 32.2(b).		
		•

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Authorized officer

I. Britel

Telephone No.: (41-22) 338.83.38

Facsimile No.: (41-22) 740.14.35

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

2 1 JAN 1999

PCT

### **PCT**

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference		FOR FURTHER A		See Notification of Transmittal of International	
RCA 88250				Preliminary Examination Report (PCT/IPEA/416)	
		International filing date (da	y/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
PCT/US97			15/12/1997		18/12/1996
	Patent	Classification (IPC) or r	national classification and IPC		
H04N7/50					
Applicant					
	100	NOUMED ELECTE	IONICS INC et al		
THOMSOI	100	NSUMER ELECTE	ONICS, INC. et al.		
			mination report has been page according to Article 36.	prepared by this	s International Preliminary Examining Authority
2. This RI	EPOR	T consists of a total of	of 5 sheets, including this	cover sheet.	
w	nich h	ave been amended a	and are the basis for this re	eport and/or she	cription, claims and/or drawings eets containing rectifications made trative Instructions under the PCT).
These	annex	es consist of a total	of 7 sheets.		
3. This re	port c	ontains indications re	elating to the following item	ıs:	
ı	$\boxtimes$	Basis of the report			
П		Priority			•
111	$\boxtimes$	Non-establishment	of opinion with regard to r	ovelty, inventiv	ve step and industrial applicability
IV		Lack of unity of inve	ention	-	
V			nt under Article 35(2) with nations supporting such st		lty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
VI		Certain documents	cited		
VII	$\boxtimes$	Certain defects in t	he international application	1	
VIII	⊠	Certain observation	ns on the international app	lication	
Date of sub	missio	o of the demand		Date of comple	etion of this report
20.0 01 900	55101	. c. are commind		2 2.2 0, 00mple	9 9. 01. 99
24/06/199	8				
Name and r	nailing	address of the IPEA/		Authorized offic	COF
<u>)</u>	D-8	opean Patent Office 0298 Munich (+49-89) 2399-0, Tx: 5	23656 epmu d	Luckett, P	The same of the sa
·		: (+49-89) 2399-4465	•	Telephone No.	(+49-89) 2399-8965

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No. PCT/US97/22845

#### I. Basis of the report

1. This report has been drawn on the basis of (substitute sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain amendments.):

	the report since they do not contain amendments.):					
	Des	cription, pages:				
	1,3-	31	as originally filed			
	2, <b>2</b> a	ı	as received on	28/12/1998	with letter of	22/12/1998
	Clai	ims, No.:				
	1-17	7	as received on	28/12/1998	with letter of	22/12/1998
	Dra	wings, sheets:				
	1/21	I-21/21	as originally filed			
2.	The	amendments have	e resulted in the cancellation of:			
		the description,	pages:			
		the claims,	Nos.:			
		the drawings,	sheets:			
3.			een established as if (some of) the beyond the disclosure as filed (F		nts had not been made	e, since they have been
4.	Add	litional observation	ns, if necessary:			
111.	. Noi	n-establishment o	of opinion with regard to novel	ty, inventive	step and industrial a	pplicability
			ne claimed invention appears to to a cable have not been examined in		volve an inventive ste	p (to be non-obvious),
		the entire internat	tional application.			
	$\boxtimes$	claims Nos. 1-16.				

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No. PCT/US97/22845

becaus	se:
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination ( <i>specify</i> ):
•	
⊠	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. 1-16 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):
	see separate sheet I+cm VIII
×	the claims, or said claims Nos. 1-16 are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
	no international search report has been established for the said claims Nos
VII. Ce	ertain defects in the international application
The fo	llowing defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:
sec	e separate sheet
VIII. C	ertain observations on the international application
	llowing observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the are fully supported by the description, are made:
Ç P	e separate sheet

### Re Item VII

- A system for reducing the memory requirements of an MPEG-video decoder is disclosed in e.g. EP-A- 0687111(D1). In this system input MPEG coded video signals are first decompressed and subsequently locally recompressed for intermediate storage to be available in subsequent processing stages. In subsequent processing a pair of parallel decompressors process respective data streams from the memory in which the locally recompressed video data are temporarily stored. In the independent claims of the present application, the main common distinguishing feature appears to relate to some unspecified form of plural local re-compressors in an MPEG decoder of this general type, without clearly specifying the relevant need for such a plurality or the data components (if any) of the input MPEG data stream to which the respective re-compressor stages are dedicated.
- The independent claims are not cast in the two part form, Rule 6.3(b), PCT, with those features which in combination are part of the prior art (see document D1) being placed in the preamble. This is considered particularly appropriate in the present case as it is essential to the establishment of clarity in the independent claims in order to put any novel subject matter underlying the present application into its proper relationship w.r.t. the prior art known from e.g. (D1).
- Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the document D1 is not mentioned in the description, nor is this document identified therein. To reflect the state of the art adequately in the description, the document D1 should be identified in the opening pages and the relevant background art disclosed therein should be briefly discussed.

### Re Item VIII

The independent claims 1,10, and 14 do not find adequate technical support in the description as required by Article 6 PCT, since their scope is broader than justified by the description and drawings. The reasons therefor are that the main embodiments described in the body of the application, all concern detailed system



**EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET** 

design, whereas the terms of the independent claims are extremely vague and fail to give a clear definition of the novel contribution they are supposed to make to the prior art.

- 5 The independent claims are not considered to be clear contrary to the requirements of Article 6 PCT. The features of the independent claims which go beyond the disclosure of D1 (in as far as they can at present be understood - cf §§ 1 & 2 above) are set out in such vague and extremely broad terms that no meaningful technical interpretation which could inventively distinguish from the disclosure of D1 is possible.
- 6 The dependent claims are not in themselves capable of overcoming the obscurities identified in the respective independent claims since they do not go into sufficient detail concerning the points raised above. Because of this the clarity objection applies equally to each of the dependent claims.